

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-16 remain pending. Independent Claims 1, 15 and 16 are amended.

At the outset, appreciation is expressed to Examiners Stelling, Savage and Smith for the courtesy extended during the March 6, 2009 interview regarding this application. The substance of that interview is reflected in the following remarks.

Claim 1 is rejected as being anticipated by Hugues.

In this rejection, the Official Action takes the position that Hugues' rotatable bowl 2 constitutes a separation device, the casing 1 constitutes a water tank, and the rotatable bowl 2 and casing 1 form a structural unit. Although Applicants do not share this view, the original wording in Claim 1 is varied in minor respects to recite in different terms that which was originally claimed.

Specifically, amended Claim 1 recites that the separation device is non-rotatably fixed to the water tank so that the separation device and the water tank form a structural unit. Clearly, as discussed during the interview, the rotatable bowl 2 is not non-rotatably fixed to the casing 1. Indeed, as discussed in lines 37-42 of col. 2 of Hugues, the rotatable bowl 2 is mounted so as to rotate around a substantially vertical axis defined by a spindle 7 which is driven by a motor or other power source and which is mounted in the casing 1 by bearings 7a.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over Hugues, and withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is also rejected as being anticipated by Perron.

In this rejection, the Official Action takes the position that Perron's centrifuge 52 constitutes a separation device, the stationary shield 74 constitutes a water tank, and the centrifuge 52 and stationary shield 74 form a structural unit. Although Applicants do not share this view, the original wording in Claim 1 is varied in minor respects to recite in different terms that which was originally claimed.

Specifically, amended Claim 1 recites that the separation device is non-rotatably fixed to the water tank so that the separation device and the water tank form a structural unit. Clearly, as discussed during the interview, the centrifuge 52 is not non-rotatably fixed to the stationary shield 74. Indeed, as discussed in lines 66-68 of col. 2 of Perron, the centrifuge 52 is acted on by a hydrostatic system comprising a pump 82 and a hydraulic motor 84 which imparts a rotation movement to the centrifuge 52.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over Perron, and withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 is also rejected as being anticipated by Perron.

In this rejection, the Official Action takes the position that Perron's centrifuge 52 constitutes a separation device, the stationary shield 74 constitutes a water tank, the centrifuge 52 and stationary shield 74 form a structural unit, and the interior of the centrifuge 52 is separated from the interior of the stationary shield 74. As discussed during the interview, Applicants do not agree with the Official Action's position for reasons consistent with the above discussion of Claim 1, and for additional reasons set forth below. Specifically, the interior of the centrifuge 52 is not separated from the interior of the stationary shield 74 in view of the perforations in

the wall 62 between the interior of the centrifuge 52 and the interior of the stationary shield 74.

Moreover, the original wording in Claim 15 is varied in minor respects to recite in different terms that which was originally claimed. Specifically, amended Claim 15 recites that the separation device is non-rotatably fixed to the water tank so that the separation device and the water tank form a structural unit. Clearly, as discussed during the interview, the centrifuge 52 is not non-rotatably fixed to the stationary shield 74. Indeed, as discussed in lines 66-68 of col. 2 of Perron, the centrifuge 52 is acted on by a hydrostatic system comprising a pump 82 and a hydraulic motor 84 which imparts a rotation movement to the centrifuge 52.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 15 is allowable over Perron, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 is also rejected as being anticipated by Perron.

In this rejection, the Official Action takes the position that Perron's centrifuge 52 constitutes a separation device, the stationary shield 74 constitutes a water tank, the centrifuge 52 and stationary shield 74 form a structural unit, and the bottom reservoir of the stationary shield 74 functions as a water settling area where entrained gasses inherently come out of solution and are removed from the opening 54. As discussed during the interview, Applicants do not agree with the Official Action's position for reasons consistent with the above discussion of Claim 1, and for additional reasons set forth below. Specifically, the Official Action's position regarding a "water settling area" in Perron apparently requires that the water received therein is supersaturated with air. However, the Official Action does not set

forth a reasoned explanation as to why water received in the bottom of the stationary shield 74 is necessarily supersaturated with air as required for inherency.

Moreover, the original wording in Claim 16 is varied in minor respects to recite in different terms that which was originally claimed. Specifically, amended Claim 16 recites that the separation device is non-rotatably fixed to the water tank so that the separation device and the water tank form a structural unit. Clearly, as discussed during the interview, the centrifuge 52 is not non-rotatably fixed to the stationary shield 74. Indeed, as discussed in lines 66-68 of col. 2 of Perron, the centrifuge 52 is acted on by a hydrostatic system comprising a pump 82 and a hydraulic motor 84 which imparts a rotation movement to the centrifuge 52.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 16 is allowable over Perron, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 16 is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent Claim 1. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 10, 2009

By: /Peter T. deVore/
Peter T. deVore
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620